

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated October 2, 2006.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamieniecki, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0066080 A1, and further in view of Huang U.S. Patent No. 6,829,512. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “a signal receiver which receives a second remote-control signal indicative of a certain operation, from a terminal which remote-controls said target device, said second remote-control signal being produced by a user actuating a predetermined key of said terminal.” Independent claim 7 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “a signal receiver which receives a second remote-control signal indicative of a certain operation, from a terminal which remote-controls said target device, said second remote-control signal being produced by a user actuating a predetermined key of said terminal.”

Independent claim 12 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “transmitting a remote-control signal to a mobile radio-signal terminal, said remote-control signal being produced by a user actuating a predetermined key of a remote-controller used for remote-controlling a target device.”

Independent claim 19 has been amended to provide, in part, for, “receiving a remote-control signal from a remote-controller used for remote-controlling said target device, said remote-control signal being produced by a user actuating a predetermined key of said remote-controller.”

Claim 13 has been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, as substantially duplicative of amended independent claim 12. Antecedent basis for the amendments to the independent claims is found in the specification, for example, on p.11, lines 1-4, and on p.13, line 28, to p.14, line 2.

As amended, the independent claims provide for a remote-control signal being produced by a user actuating a predetermined key of a terminal or remote-controller remote-controlling a target device. The remote-control signal is used by a data server to select remote-control data or codes used for remote-controlling the target device. The selected remote-control data or codes are transmitted to the mobile radio-signal terminal and are stored in the memory of the mobile radio-signal terminal. Such a combination of features is nowhere disclosed, taught, or suggested by Kamieniecki. In support of the rejection of claim 13, the Examiner alleges that, “Kamieniecki further teaches a method, wherein a user actuates a predetermined key of a remote-controller

used for remote-controlling said target device (see p. 3 [0031] and p. 5 [0044]),” (Office Action, page 7, lines 2-4). Although paragraph [0044] of Kamieniecki discusses an exemplary key or button-push sequence from a native remote control 108, that key or button-push sequence is used to identify the electronic device using the native remote control 108, (see also paragraph [0045]). That key or button-push is not disclosed, taught or suggested to result in the storing of remote-control codes or remote-control data used for remote-controlling a target device in a mobile radio-signal terminal, as claimed in the independent claims herein.

Huang appears to disclose the transmission of a plurality of command codes from a controlling device, in response to activation of a command key, to remotely control the operation of at least one consumer appliance, (col. 3, lines 24-28). However, is no disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Huang et al. of the storage of remote-control codes or remote-control data used for remote-controlling a target device in a mobile radio-signal terminal as a result of the activation of a predetermined key of a terminal or remote-controller remote-controlling the target device.

Since each of claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-18, and 20-22 are directly or indirectly dependent upon one of independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 19, each of dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-18, and 20-22 is allowable over Kamieniecki in view of Huang for the same reasons recited above with respect to the allowability of independent claims 1, 7, 12, and 19 over Kamieniecki in view of Huang.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-12 and 14-22 is respectfully requested. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON DECEMBER 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700